

REMARKS

The non-final office action that was mailed July 23, 2008, objected to claims 1, 15, and 25, and rejected claims 1-15 and 25. Applicant has amended each of claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10-11, 13-15, and 25 to more particularly define the subject matter sought to be patented, added new claim 27, and canceled claim 5 without prejudice. The amendments add no new matter. Claims 1-4, 6-15, 25, and 27 are pending, and Applicant requests reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objected to claims 1, 15, and 25 because of informalities. Applicant has amended claim 1 (and similarly for claims 15 and 25) to clarify that the processing module is programmed to receive at least one first information value of the multiple information values, to invoke a first execution of an analytical task, and to receive at least one second information value after invoking a first execution of the analytical task, wherein the at least one second information value of the multiple information values has not yet been received by the processing module when the first execution is invoked. The amendments add no new matter and are fully supported by the original specification (e.g., at page 4, lines 3-29).

Claim 1 (and similarly for claims 15 and 25) recites receiving a request from a front-end software application, invoking first and second executions of an analytical task, and providing an output to the front-end software application using a result from at least one of the first and second executions of the analytical task. Without limitation, in various implementations the output may be provided using a result of the first execution of the task, using a result of the second execution of the task, or using a result of the first execution of the task and a result of the second execution of the task.

Applicant submits that the Examiner's concerns have been addressed, and requests withdrawal of the claim objections to claims 1, 15 and 25.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Office Action rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to recite “a first analytical engine; a second analytical engine; and a processing module,” and has amended dependent claims 2, 6-8, 10-11, and 13-14 for consistency with amended independent claim 1. The amendments add no new matter and are fully supported by the original specification (e.g., at FIG. 1 and the corresponding description).

Applicant submits that claims 1-14, as amended, are directed to statutory subject matter, and requests withdrawal of the non-statutory subject matter claim rejections of these claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-15 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,236,978 to Tuzhilin et al. (“Tuzhilin”).

Tuzhilin discloses a personal shopping assistant system that provides recommendations of products or services that a user should consider purchasing. *See* col. 10, lines 50-54. Information on previous transactions completed by a user is used to estimate a future purchasing need. *See* col. 11, lines 14-21. The purchasing need is matched against a range of products and services offered by suppliers so that recommendations can be provided. *See* col. 11, lines 52-66.

Amended claim 1 is patentable over Tuzhilin because Tuzhilin neither discloses nor suggests a computer system to invoke multiple executions of an analytical task and provide an analytical output in response that includes, *inter alia*, a processing module programmed to receive a request for analytical information to be determined using any of multiple information values, receive at least one first information value of the multiple information values, invoke a first execution of the analytical task by providing the at least one first information value to a first analytical engine, wherein at least one second information value of the multiple information values has not yet been received by the processing module when the first execution is invoked, receive the at least one second information value after invoking the first execution, invoke a second execution of the analytical task by providing the at least one first and the at least one

second information values to a second analytical engine, and provide an output using a result from at least one of the first and second executions of the analytical task.

Tuzhilin, by contrast, discloses a personal shopping assistant system that includes a module 140 for estimating a user's purchasing needs based on user profiles and information about the user, *see* FIG. 6a and col. 11, lns. 42-52, and a module 145 that matches a need with products or services being offered to produce a purchasing recommendation. Nowhere does Tuzhilin disclose or suggest successive invocations of the same analytical task by providing a first information value to a first analytical engine, and then by providing the first and at least one second information value to a second analytical engine, where the at least one second information value has not yet been received by the processing module when the first execution is invoked.

In contending that Tuzhilin anticipates claim 1, the office action cited, at column 12 lines 4-24 of Tuzhilin, information that the user has purchased a ticket to Paris as corresponding to the at least one first information value, and cited information that the duty-free shop at the airport is having a sale as the at least one second information value. *See* office action, page 5. These information values, however, are used by the Tuzhilin system to perform separate and distinct tasks – namely, to determine a purchasing need using module 140 in the case of the ticket purchase information (which originates from storage unit 120), and to determine a purchase recommendation using module 145 in the case of the airport sale information (which originates from module 150). Indeed, the information regarding the sale at the airport is not relevant to determining the user purchasing needs, and is not even available to module 140 for execution of the purchasing needs task, as shown in FIG. 6a. Simply put, while Tuzhilin discloses separate modules (modules 140 and 145) that each perform analytical tasks, the tasks are different, in contrast to claim 1 which recites two executions of the same analytical task.

Claim 1 is also not obvious in view of Tuzhilin. Applicant's system enables various procedures to be performed that are not possible with the structures disclosed in Tuzhilin, and are not even contemplated by Tuzhilin. For example, Applicant's system may be used to incrementally invoke execution of an analytical task as it asynchronously obtains additional input

information. *See* Applicant's specification page 5, lines 4-15, and page 7, lines 7-9. This may provide flexibility because predictive output can be provided and used quickly, if timeliness is a priority, while higher-quality predictive output can subsequently be provided and used when such output is desired. *See* Applicant's specification page 12, lines 18-22, and at page 13, lines 5-12. Additionally, the first and second executions of the analytical task may occur in parallel using Applicant's system, *see* Applicant's specification page 4, lines 22-26, which would not be possible using the structures of Tuzhilin.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Tuzhilin, as are dependent claims 2-4 and 6-14, and Applicant requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of these claims.

New dependent claim 27, which depends from claim 1, is patentable over Tuzhilin for at least the reasons described above with reference to claim 1, and is additionally patentable over Tuzhilin because Tuzhilin fails to disclose or suggest a computer system that includes a processing module programmed to invoke a second execution of the analytical task before a first execution of the analytical task finishes.

Claims 15 and 25 are directed to a computer-implemented method and a computer-readable medium, respectively, and are patentable over Tuzhilin for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of these claims.

#### CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that each of claims 1-4, 6-15, 25, and 27 is in condition for immediate allowance, and requests that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, objection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, objection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated

Applicant : Achim Kraiss  
Serial No. : 10/757,315  
Filed : January 14, 2004  
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-0136001 / 2003P00591US

in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please charge deposit account 06-1050 in the amount of \$130 for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 21 Nov. 2008



Kurt F. Krenz  
Reg. No. 62,664

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
60 South Sixth Street  
Suite 3300  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Telephone: (612) 335-5070  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945